

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 and 25 are pending in the application. Claim 24 has been canceled. Claims 13-20 have been withdrawn from consideration. New claim 25 has been added.

NonEntry of Reply After Final Filed on January 19, 2007

Non-entry of the Reply After Final filed on January 19, 2007 and entry of this Reply After Final is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

Applicants submitted the January 19, 2007 Reply After Final in response to the final Office Action dated October 19, 2006. Applicants, however, inadvertently did not add new claim 25, dependent on claim 6. Therefore, in this Second Reply After Final, claim 25 has been added to obtain more comprehensive protection of the present invention.

A favorable determination by the Examiner is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 6 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by McDermott (USP 6,227,685). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

McDermott discloses, in Fig. 2, an electronic wide angle lighting device that includes a reflector 8 and a LED element 33 provided inside a space defined by the reflector 8.

McDermott also discloses, in Figs. 8 and 9, a circuit board 49 that supports a casting 48 having a plurality of lighting devices 30.

In McDermott, however, the reflector 8 of the lighting device is circular in shape (see Fig. 1) and does not have "a substantially rectangular shape," as recited in claim 6.

Since the envelope of the emitted light in McDermott is conical, light cannot be efficiently emitted beyond an angle of view.

In contrast, by providing a reflector having a substantially rectangular shape, light can be more efficiently emitted and stronger light can be emitted to the subject by the same amount of light (Please refer to Drawing A attached to the Reply filed on August 21, 2006).

Claim 10, dependent on claim 6, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 6.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

(a) Claims 1, 5, and 21-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over James et al. (USP 4,306,716) in view of Chen (USP 5,119,174). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

James discloses a lighting apparatus having a circuit board 70 on which a plurality of diode segments 42, 43, 44 is mounted. James also discloses a light control member 72 having a plurality of light control portions 76, 77, 78. Each light control portion is circular in shape and has an opening at an upper end thereof, such that a diode segment is surrounded by the light control portion when the circuit board 70 is attached to the light control member 72.

However, as acknowledged by the Examiner, James does not disclose a reflecting surface formed on a surface of the circuit board.

Therefore, the Examiner relies on the Chen reference, which discloses a PCB base 12 having a circular dimple portion in which an LED crystal is mounted. Chen also discloses a

copper foil 21 attached to the dimple portion as well as to a surface that surrounds the dimple portion.

Applicants submit, however, that even assuming that James can be combined with Chen, one skilled in the art would, at best, conceive the lighting apparatus of James modified by providing a copper foil of Chen on a surface of the circuit board 70. Both references, taken singly or in combination, fails to disclose or suggest "a reflector, having a substantially rectangular shape," as recited in claim 1.

Claims 5 and 21-23, dependent on claim 1, are allowable at least for their dependency on claim 1.

Claim 23 is allowable at least for the similar reasons as stated in the foregoing with regard to claim 1.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

(b) Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over James in view of Chen, and further in view of Koay et al. (US 2002/0047130). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 2, dependent on claim 1, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 1.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

(c) Claims 3, 4, 11, and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over James and Chen, and further in view of Kitano et al. (US 2003/0216151). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3, 4, 11, and 12, dependent on claim 1, are allowable at least for their dependency on claim 1.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

(d) Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDermott in view of Kitano. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7, dependent on claim 6, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 6.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

(e) Claims 8, 9, and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDermott in view of Sommers (US 2003/0180037). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 8, 9, and 25, dependent on claim 6, are allowable at least for their dependency on claim 6. Claim 24 has been canceled.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

New Claim

Claim 25, dependent on claim 6, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 6.

A favorable determination by the Examiner and allowance of this new claim is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of the pending claims in the present application are respectfully requested.


The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter this Reply After Final in that it raises no new issues. Alternatively, the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter this Reply After Final in that it places the application in better form for Appeal.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Maki Hatsumi (#40,417) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: January 31, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By  (reg. # 40,417)
for Michael R. Cammarata
Registration No.: 39,491
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant